



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,889	02/12/2001	Sadahiko Yamaoka	1232-4684	9633
27123	7590	06/20/2006	EXAMINER	
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101			POND, ROBERT M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3625	

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/781,889		YAMAOKA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Robert M. Pond		3625	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection.

Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 07 April 2006 has been entered.

### ***Response to Amendment***

The Applicant previously canceled claim 16-20 and newly added claim 21. All pending claims (1-15 and 21) were examined in this non-final office action.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-15 and 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. **Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sanne (US 6,295,536).**

Sanne teaches all the limitations of claims 1, 4, 6, 9, and 21. For example, Sanne discloses a system and method for users within a multi-organization to access electronic catalogs regardless of location. Sanne discloses the system routing catalog information to geographically and organizationally diverse users. Sanne discloses an enterprise organization comprising sub-unit organizations (e.g. Agency A through Agency Z) and each agency within the enterprise having an agency profile. Sanne discloses each user having a user profile (see at least title; abstract; Fig.1 (10a-f, 11a, 11z, 15, 16, 19a, 19z); col. 1, line 5 through col. 2, line 48). Sanne further discloses:

- Parts database storing parts information: (see at least col. 7, lines 26-57).
- First designating means for designating parts/material; searching and displaying: Inherent in Sanne are the structures permitting a first designating means for designating parts/material and displaying searched

parts information. For example, Sanne discloses an example of data stored in an agency database comprising a part description (i.e. computer), pricing, supplier identification data, etc (see at least col. 7, lines 26-57); searching and displaying using web browser user interface (see at least col. 4, lines 50-64; col. 5, lines 17-30).

- Pricing database: catalog pricing stored in Agency A database through Agency Z database (see at least Fig. 1(19a, 19z); Fig. 2B (24); Fig. 2C(24)).
- Second designating means for parts/material; searching and displaying: Inherent in Sanne are the structures permitting a second designating means for designating parts/material and displaying searched parts information. For example, Sanne discloses an example of data stored in any Agency A - Agency Z database comprising a part description (i.e. computer), pricing, supplier identification data, etc (see at least col. 7, lines 26-57); searching and displaying using web browser user interface (see at least col. 4, lines 50-64; col. 5, lines 17-30).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject

matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**2. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 10-15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanne (US 6,295,536) in view of Wiecha (US 5,870,717).**

Sanne teaches all the above as noted under the 102(e) rejection and teaches a user accessing electronic catalogs within a multi-organizational enterprise regardless of location and organization (i.e. agency within an enterprise), and further teaches variations in local databases pertaining to supplier products and services, but does not specifically disclose displaying price difference control means for displaying a price difference between respective agency catalogs. Wiecha teaches procurement procedures in corporations of all sizes, making improvements by implementing one or more electronic catalogs for corporate users to access, and further teaches facilitating comparison of products between multiple suppliers and displaying differences between comparable items (see at least abstract; Fig. 6; col. 1, line 5 through col. 2, line 50; col. 3, lines 18-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of the invention to modify the system of Sanne to provide pricing comparison/difference for comparable items as taught by Wiecha, in order to facilitate cost cutting by comparing comparable items sourced across multiple agencies within an enterprise. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefit of comparing comparable items across the enterprise.

Sanne teaches all the above as noted under the 103(a) rejection and teaches storing unit cost of an item associated with a pending purchase order, but does

Art Unit: 3625

not specifically disclose storing unit price history. Wiecha teaches all the above as noted under the 103(a) rejection and teaches browsing archive purchase order files and archiving multiple purchase order to multiple customer/vendor file systems (see at least col. 15, lines 46-55). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of the invention to modify the system of Sanne to store purchase order history as taught by Wiecha, in order to maintain browsable archive of past purchase orders.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Pond whose telephone number is 571-272-6760. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Mark Fadok can be reached on 571-272-6755. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Robert M. Pond  
Primary Examiner  
June 16, 2006